

**REMARKS**

Claims 42-46, 48-54, 56, 58-63, and 64-70 are pending.  
Claims 42, 50, and 58 are in independent form.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview granted with Applicant's representative on April 9, 2007, at which time claim 42 and the arguments presented hereinafter were discussed. Further, the subject matter recited in new dependent claims 66-70 was also discussed.

Independent Claims 42 and 50

Claims 42 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,311,163 to Sheehan et al. (hereinafter "Sheehan"), U.S. Patent No. 6,275,941 to Saito et al. (hereinafter "Saito"), and the State of Colorado Senate Bill 97134 ILS No. 970530.01 (hereinafter "Colorado").

As amended, claim 42 relates to a machine-implemented method that includes receiving, at an authentication service, digital credential information associated with a first user from a relying party, verifying that the digital credential information is valid using professional license status information that has been stored for a plurality of users, providing verification information indicative of a valid professional license of the first user from the authentication service to the relying party, and providing information from the authentication service to the first user. The information

provided to the first user is indicative of receipt of valid digital credential information from the relying party. The relying party is distinct from the first user.

As amended, claim 50 relates to an article comprising a machine-readable medium embodying information indicative of instructions. When the instructions are performed by one or more machines of an authentication service, operations related to the method of claim 42 result.

The rejections of claims 42 and 50 are based on the contention that access control information which is sent from Saito's authentication server 2 to application server 6 constitutes information indicative of receiving valid digital credential information associated with the first user from a relying party.

However, claims 42 and 50 also recite that verification information indicative of a valid professional license of the first user is provided from the authentication service to a relying party. The recited authentication service thus provides:

- verification information indicative of a valid professional license to the relying party, and

- information indicative of receipt of valid digital credential information to the first user.

Moreover, claims 42 and 50 have been amended to recite that the relying party is distinct from the first user. In other words, the recited authentication service provides information to two distinct parties.

Saito's authentication server 2 does not provide such information to two distinct parties. For example, upon confirmation of an integrated certificate (at 510, FIG. 5), Saito's authentication server 2 provides access control information only to Application Server 6. Subsequent communications with client 8 are handled by Application Server 6.

As for Saito's "log-in reject," as discussed in the response filed August 24, 2006, Saito's "log-in reject" only indicates that invalid information has been received, not that valid digital credential information has been received or that a professional license of a first user is valid.

Neither Sheehan nor Colorado remedy these deficiencies in Saito. As discussed previously, Sheehan fails to describe or suggest providing information indicative of any receipt (valid or otherwise) of digital credential information associated with the first user from a relying party. Colorado is a bill that sets forth requirements for the completion of a prescription. Colorado is entirely silent on any provision of information from an authentication service, as recited in claims 42 and 50.

Accordingly, elements and/or limitations in claims 42 and 50 are neither described nor suggested by Sheehan, Saito, and Colorado. Hence, even if Sheehan, Saito, and Colorado were combined, one of ordinary skill would not arrive at the subject matter recited in claims 42 and 50. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 42, 50, and the claims dependent therefrom be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 58

Claim 58 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Sheehan, Saito, and Colorado.

As amended, claim 58 relates to a system that includes storage configured to store professional license status information for a plurality of users and an authentication server. The authentication service is configured to receive digital credential information associated with a first user from a relying party, verify the digital credential information using the professional license status information, provide verification information indicative of a valid professional license of the first user to the relying party, and provide information to the first user. The information is indicative of receipt of valid digital credential information associated with the first user from the relying party. The relying party is distinct from the first user.

The rejection of claim 58 is based on the contention that access control information which is sent from Saito's authentication server 2 to application server 6 constitutes information indicative of receiving valid digital credential information associated with the first user from a relying party.

However, claim 58 also recites that the authentication service is configured to provide verification information indicative of a valid professional license of the first user to the relying party. The recited authentication service is thus configured to provide information to two distinct parties.


As discussed above, Saito's authentication server 2 does not provide such information to two distinct parties and neither Sheehan nor Colorado remedy these deficiencies in Saito.

Accordingly, elements and/or limitations in claim 58 are neither described nor suggested by Sheehan, Saito, and Colorado. Hence, even if Sheehan, Saito, and Colorado were combined, one of ordinary skill would not arrive at the recited subject matter. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejections of claim 58 and the claims dependent therefrom be withdrawn.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. No fees are believed due at this time. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 11, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott C. Harris  
Reg. No. 32,030  
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
PTO Customer No. **20985**  
12390 El Camino Real  
San Diego, California 92130  
(858) 678-5070 telephone  
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

BY  
**JOHN F. CONROY**  
**REG. NO. 45,485**